

Environmental Checklist Form

1. Project Title:

“Residential Second Units in Agricultural Zoning Districts” County File # ZT050002

2. Lead Agency Name and Address:

Contra Costa County, Community Development Department
Administrative Building
651 Pine Street
4th Floor – North Wing
Martinez, CA 94553-1295

3. Contact Person and Phone Number:

David Brockbank, Planner
Community Development Department
Administrative Building
651 Pine Street
2nd Floor – North Wing
Martinez, CA 94553-1295
(925) 335-1206

4. Project Location:

“County Wide” means the entire unincorporated area of Contra Costa County.

5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:

Contra Costa County
Administrative Building
651 Pine Street
2nd Floor – North Wing
Martinez, CA 94553-1295

6. General Plan Designation:

Section 65860 of the California Government Code requires that a jurisdiction’s zoning ordinance be consistent with its General Plan. It also provides that in order for the ordinance to be consistent with the General Plan, the various land uses authorized by the ordinance are compatible with the objective, policies, general land uses, and programs specified in the General Plan. The vast majority of agricultural zoning districts are located within Public, Semi-Public, Landfill, and Open Space designations under the General Plan. Therefore, those General Plan designations that find residential development appropriate [e.g. Agricultural Lands (AL), Agricultural Core (AC), and Delta Recreation (DR)]; second units would be considered a compatible use. However, those General Plan designations where residential development is not appropriate [e.g. Water (WA), Watershed (WS),

Parks and Recreation (PR)], second units would not be a consistent use and thus, would not be permitted in those designations.

7. Zoning:

The following zoning districts will be affected by the proposed text amendment: General Agricultural (A-2), Heavy Agricultural (A-3), Agricultural Preserve (A-4), and the Exclusive Agricultural Districts (A-20, A-40, and A-80). The proposed amendment to the Residential Second Unit Ordinance will add these districts to the allowable “Location” section of the second unit ordinance, and it will not provide exceptions or deviations from the development standards required for the existing second unit ordinance.

8. Description of Project:

The project involves amending the existing Residential Second Unit Ordinance (Chapter 82-24 of the County Code) to allow second units as a permitted use in all of the agricultural zoning districts. The following actions are proposed: 1) adoption of a text amendment that allows residential second units in the agricultural zoning districts, and 2) adoption of subsequent text amendments to add residential second units in the permitted use sections under the specific agricultural zoning districts.

Proposed Project: The proposed project, would add all the agricultural zoning districts [General Agricultural (A-2), Heavy Agricultural (A-3), Agricultural Preserve, and the Exclusive Agricultural Districts (A-20, A-40, and A-80)] to the “Location” section (82-24.008) of the existing Residential Second Unit Ordinance. The new ordinance amendment, if approved, will require second units in agricultural zoning districts to comply with all existing procedures and regulations set forth in Chapter 82-24 of the Contra Costa County Code.

Additionally, the A-2, A-4, and A-20 Zoning Districts will each individually be modified to include residential second units as permitted or allowed uses. The respective Code Sections to be modified for these zoning districts are 84-38.402, 84-42.402, and 84-80.402.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

This proposed amendment to the Residential Second Unit Ordinance will affect only the agricultural zoning districts, which are located throughout the County. Due to the vast tracts of land that are zoned for agricultural use and the wide range of areas that these zoning districts are located within, numerous land uses generally abut these areas, rather than surround the agriculturally zoned parcels. The various land uses which abut agriculturally zoned land include single-family residential, multiple-family residential, industrial, and commercial uses.

10. Approvals:

Proposed Adoption of an Amendment to the Residential Second Unit Ordinance Text Amendment (File #ZT05-0002) – A proposal to adopt an amendment to the Residential Second Unit Ordinance, Chapter 82-24 of the County Code. This is new text that proposes to add the agricultural zoning districts in the “Location” section (allowable zoning districts) of the existing second unit ordinance. The ordinance also intends to provide a new permitted land use (second units) in the agricultural zoning districts.

11. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financing, approval, or participation agreement):

Not Applicable

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- X I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.

Signature

Date

David Brockbank
Project Planner
Contra Costa County Community Development Department

SOURCES

In the process of preparing the Checklist and conducting the evaluation, the following references (which are available for review at the Contra Costa County Community Development Department, 651 Pine Street 2nd Floor-North Wing, Martinez) were consulted:

- 1) Contra Costa County General Plan, (2005-2020)
- 2) Title 8, Planning and Zoning Ordinance, Contra Costa County
- 3) California State Government Code Section 65852.2
- 4) Community Development Department Digital Map Library
- 5) Draft East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan – June 2005
- 6) Project Description
- 7) Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines, 1999
- 8) State of California, Department of Conservation Important Farmland Map, 2000
- 9) 2002 Hazardous Waste and Substance Sites (Cortese C) List – State of California
- 10) Amended Residential Second Unit Ordinance Draft – 2005
- 11) California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection Summary

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. <u>AESTHETICS</u> – Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (Source: 1)	_____	_____	<u>X</u>	_____
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? (Source: 1)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (Sources: 1)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (Sources: 6)	_____	_____	<u>X</u>	_____

SUMMARY: *Less than Significant Impact*

- a) Amending the Residential Second Unit Ordinance to permit second units in agricultural zoning districts could increase the number of residential units allowed on agriculturally zoned land. Many of the scenic ridgelines designated in the County General Plan are located in agriculturally zoned land. However, since residential second units are only allowed on properties that contain an existing or are proposed concurrently with the construction of a primary residence, the impact on scenic vistas will be less than significant.
- b) The current residential second unit ordinance provides specific development standards (e.g. must meet setback requirements, limited in size, and architectural compatibility) that must be met in order to be approved. Therefore second units that conform to these development standards, and otherwise are in compliance with the other applicable zoning codes that regulate residential development, such as the Tree Protection and Preservation Ordinance and Grading Division; there would be no impact.
- c) The implementation of this ordinance amendment would not significantly degrade the existing visual character of agriculturally zoned properties since residential second units are limited to maximum size of 1,000 square feet of living space and up to 1,400 square feet with an attached garage and require the existence of or concurrent construction of a primary residence on the property.
- d) Residential second units in agricultural zoning districts could create a new source of light and potential glare because a residential unit would be located where there was not source of light before. But considering the size limitation and allowance of only one second unit per agricultural parcel, the impact is considered less than significant.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

- a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (Source: 1, 8)
- | | | | |
|-------|-------|----------|-------|
| _____ | _____ | <u>X</u> | _____ |
|-------|-------|----------|-------|

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract? (Sources: 1, 2)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
c. Involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use? (Sources: 1, 8)	_____	_____	<u>X</u>	_____

SUMMARY: *Less than Significant Impact*

- a , c) According to the State of California Department of Conservation Map of Important Farmland, there are areas of prime agricultural farmland within Contra Costa County. The proposed ordinance amendment would allow for second units to be permitted on all agriculturally zoned properties. Some of these districts may contain designated Prime Farmland areas, but the majority do not. There is also a size limitation on second units of 1,000 square feet of living space and up to a maximum of 1,400 square feet with an attached garage. This the potential for converting farmland to a residential use (non-agricultural) less than significant.
- b) Properties that are currently in a Williamson Act Contract could not apply for a second unit as this use was not previously allowed under the contract. Those existing contracts would have to be amended to include the establishment of a second unit prior to approving a second unit application. Therefore, this would have no impact on existing Williamson Act Contracts. The ordinance amendment would allow for second units to be permitted in the Agricultural Preserve (A-4) and Exclusive Agricultural (A-20, A-40, A-80) Zoning Districts, but would require the second unit as a structure to be incorporated into the Williamson Act Contract.

III. AIR QUALITY

a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Sources: 1, 7)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Sources: 1, 7)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is a non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (Sources: 1, 7)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Sources: 1, 7)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Source: 7)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>

SUMMARY: *No Impact*

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

- a-e) No development or physical changes are enabled with this regulatory action. The zoning code text amendment would not allow development where the current zoning and General Plan do not currently allow residential second unit development.

The text amendments allow residential second units to be built in agricultural zoning districts. These amendments do not modify the standards for clean air as required by the Bay Area Air Management District and are not changed with this new level of review and therefore will not have an adverse affect on air pollution.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (Sources: 1, 6)	_____	_____	<u>X</u>	_____
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (Sources: 1, 6)	_____	_____	<u>X</u>	_____
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (Sources: 1, 6)	_____	_____	<u>X</u>	_____
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? (Sources: 1)	_____	_____	<u>X</u>	_____
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance? (Sources: 1,2)	_____	_____	<u>X</u>	_____
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan? (Source: 1)	_____	_____	<u>X</u>	_____

SUMMARY: *Less than Significant Impact*

- a-f) The project involves a text amendment to the County Zoning Ordinance Code. It is regulatory in nature and the proposed action would not confer any entitlement or approval of development. Although second units would be permitted within agricultural zoning districts, it is speculative to

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

anticipate the number and location of residential second units that would be located in such districts. Based on a review of the proposed text amendments, including the existing development standards that second units are required to meet, there is no substantial evidence that the project would have a significant impact on biological resources.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5? (Source: 6)	_____	_____	<u>X</u>	_____
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5? (Source: 1, 6)	_____	_____	<u>X</u>	_____
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature? (Sources: 6)	_____	_____	<u>X</u>	_____
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (Source: 6)	_____	_____	<u>X</u>	_____

SUMMARY: *Less than Significant Impact*

- a – d) The proposal consists of amending the zoning code to allow residential second units in the agricultural zoning districts, and including second units in the allowed uses section of specific agricultural zoning districts. These code changes do not adversely affect historical, archaeological, or other unique features on a collective or individual basis. The adoption of text amendments that would allow second units in agricultural zones changes the development review process. The potential impacts on cultural resources to the extent that they are known on existing agriculturally zoned properties would be speculative. The proposed text amendments would have a less than significant impact on cultural and historical resources.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
1. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. (Source: 1, 10)	_____	_____	<u>X</u>	_____
2. Strong seismic ground shaking? (Source: 1)	_____	_____	<u>X</u>	_____
3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Source: 1, 10)	_____	_____	<u>X</u>	_____
4. Landslides? (Source: 1, 10)	_____	_____	<u>X</u>	_____
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (Source: 1, 10)	_____	_____	<u>X</u>	_____

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? (Source: 1, 10)	_____	_____	<u>X</u>	_____
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1998), creating substantial risks to life or property? (Source: 1, 10)	_____	_____	<u>X</u>	_____
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? (Source: 1)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>

SUMMARY: *Less than Significant Impact*

- a-e) This project does not propose any construction improvements within the County. As stated previously, the text amendments do provide for a residential second unit development procedures for newly proposed residential construction.

There are areas in the County that are within an Earthquake Fault Zone (formerly known as Alquist Priolo Special Study Zone), and as such structures for human occupancy may have further structural requirements in addition to the proposed design criteria.

The proposed code change would allow second units in agricultural zoning districts. Some agricultural zoning districts are located in areas the County General Plan has determined to contain certain geologic hazards. However, buildings are required to be in compliance with the California and Uniform Building Codes.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials? (Source: 6)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (Source: 6)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (Source: 1, 6)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65862.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (Source: 9)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. (Source: 1)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Source: 1)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Sources: 1, 8)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (Source: 1, 11)	_____	_____	<u>X</u>	_____

SUMMARY: *Less than Significant Impact*

- a-h) Text amendments to allow residential second units in agricultural zoning districts will not have an adverse affect on hazards and hazardous materials. Permitting residential second units in agricultural zones could potentially expose these small residences to wildland fires. However, because the Uniform Building Code and Uniform Fire Code require homes that are constructed in rural areas to be built with non-combustible or fire-retardant materials, the impact is less than significant.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:

a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? (Source: 6)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? (Source: 6)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? (Source: 3, 6)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface run-off in a manner that would result in flooding on-or off-site? (Sources: 3, 6)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e. Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? (Sources: 1, 6)	_____	_____	_____	_____
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? (Source: 6)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (Sources: 6)	_____	_____	<u>X</u>	_____
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows? (Sources: 3, 6)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (Sources: 1)	_____	_____	<u>X</u>	_____
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? (Source: 1)	_____	_____	<u>X</u>	_____

SUMMARY: *Less than Significant Impact*

- a-f) Typically, agricultural zoning districts are not connected to a water service provider but are supplied through water wells. Well water is regulated by the Environmental Health Division of the County Health Services Department. Before a second unit could be permitted on properties where water is supplied by a well, the appropriate standards for water pressure would have to be reviewed for adequacy. This is considered a less than significant impact.
- g-j) The amendments to the zoning code change would allow residential second units in agricultural zoning districts. Some agricultural zoning districts are located within Flood Zone A (100-year flood hazard). Prior to a building permit being issued for a second unit in Flood Zone A, the unit would be subject to the Floodplain Management Ordinance, and a flood plain permit would need to be obtained. The text amendments do not modify the standards for water quality and are not changed with this new level of review and therefore will not have an adverse affect on Hydrology.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:

a. Physically divide an established community? (Sources: 1, 4, 5)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or the regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (Sources: 1, 2)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? (Source: 1)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

SUMMARY: *No Impact*

- a) The change in regulatory procedures allowing second units in agricultural zoning districts would not physically divide a community.
- b) The proposal involves amending the Residential Second Unit Ordinance that would allow second units in agricultural zoning districts. Agricultural zoning districts are located within various Open Space General Plan Designations under the County General Plan and residential use is appropriate for only some of these designations. Therefore, second units would only be permitted on those agricultural properties that have a consistent General Plan designation.
- c) The County has not yet adopted any Habitat Conservation Plan and therefore the proposed text amendment is not in conflict with any conservation plan.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
| a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (Source: 1) | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |
| b. Result in the loss or availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan? (Source: 1) | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |

SUMMARY: *No Impact*

- a – b) Although mineral resources are located within agricultural zoning districts, County General Plan Policy Nos. 8-56 and 8-57 state incompatible land uses shall not be permitted within mineral resource impact areas, and defines those land uses that are inherently incompatible with mining and/or uses that require investment in public or private structures. Therefore second units would not be permitted in areas determined to contain mineral resources.

XI. NOISE – Would the project result in:

- | | | | | |
|---|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
| a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (Sources: 1, 6) | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |
| b. Exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels? (Source: 6) | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |
| c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Sources: 3, 6) | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |
| d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Sources: 3, 6) | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Source: 1)	_____	_____	_____	_____
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Source: 1)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>

SUMMARY: No Impact

- a-f) There is no development being proposed, no site disturbance, and no improvements required through the proposed text amendments. The inclusion of agricultural zoning districts in the Residential Second Unit Ordinance is a text amendment that will require adherence to specific development guidelines for new second units located within agricultural districts. There is no evidence to suggest that amending the zoning code will expose persons to excessive noise levels.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:

a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (Source: 6)	_____	_____	<u>X</u>	_____
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Source: 3, 6)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Source: 6)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>

SUMMARY: Less than Significant Impact

- a) Allowing residential second units in agriculturally zoned properties might in some areas increase population growth by permitting second units to be built. However, because agricultural zoning districts are spread throughout the County, population growth will not be relegated to any one specific area of the County and it will be spread gradually over time (permit by permit). Therefore this population growth will have a less than significant impact.
- b – c) Permitting residential second units in agriculturally zoned properties will not displace existing housing or substantial numbers of people. Rather these zoning code amendments will allow for additional housing development and will contribute measurably to affordable housing.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

- a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services? (Sources: 3, 6)				
1. Fire Protection?	_____	_____	<u>X</u>	_____
2. Police Protection?	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
3. Schools?	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
4. Parks?	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
5. Other public facilities?	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>

SUMMARY: *Less than Significant Impact*

- a-(1) Allowing second units in agricultural zoning district would allow the establishment of new residential units. The potential for additional housing units could increase the demand for fire protection service. However, this impact is considered less than significant because the Uniform Building Code and Uniform Fire Code do require homes that are constructed in rural areas to be built with non-combustible or fire-retardant materials.
- (2-5) Due to the limitation on size for residential second units, and because residential second units can only be established on properties where a primary residence already exists or is being built concurrently, these properties already have public services provided and therefore will not increase the demand for the remaining public services.

XIV. RECREATION

- | | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|----------|-------|
| a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (Source: 6) | _____ | _____ | <u>X</u> | _____ |
| b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (Source: 6) | _____ | _____ | <u>X</u> | _____ |

SUMMARY: *Less than Significant Impact*

- a – b) Although second units do not count towards housing density, second units are considered residential development. Thus the proposed text amendment would potentially increase residential units in agricultural zoning districts. However, this would only result in having a minor increase in the demand for recreational facilities. Additionally, residential second units are subject to paying appropriate Park Dedication fees. These fees in conjunction with the size limitation (maximum 1,000 square feet of living space) imposed on these units offset the very minor impact on recreational facilities.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. <u>TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</u> – Would the project:				
a. Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e. result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections? (Source: 1, 6)	_____	_____	<u>X</u>	_____
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? (Source: 1, 6)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? (Sources: 1, 6)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)? (Source: 6)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
e. Result in inadequate emergency access? (Source: 10)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity? (Sources: 2, 6)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? (Sources: 1)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>

SUMMARY: *Less than Significant Impact*

- a – g) There is no change to traffic or transportation being proposed with this project as no development is proposed by these code amendments. The regulatory amendments will not change existing traffic patterns. This project allows residential second units in agricultural zoning districts, which do not conflict with any policies, related to traffic and transportation, but the project does have the potential to create additional traffic by allowing new residential second units to be built, and therefore will result in less than significant impacts to roads and traffic.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (Source: 6)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Sources: 6)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Source:	_____	_____	_____	_____

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
6)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
d. Have sufficient water supplies available serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (Source: 6)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? (Source: 6)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's waste disposal needs? (Source: 1, 6)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
g. Comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (Source: 1)	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>

SUMMARY: *No Impact*

- a - g) Utility services may not involve the increase in demand from service utility providers or districts, but rather requiring additional water wells and larger septic systems. If it has been determined that the property where these second units are proposed cannot adequately provide these necessary services to the new unit, then the second unit would not be permitted and therefore will not have an impact.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish and wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (Cumulatively considerable means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	_____	_____	<u>X</u>	_____
c. Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>

SUMMARY: *Less than Significant Impact*

- a & c) There is no development being proposed by these zoning code amendments. The new ordinance amendments, if approved, will require compliance with an established set of development

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

standards for all parcels agriculturally zoned within the County. The regulatory changes would not degrade the quality of the environment, nor have significant effects on human beings either directly or indirectly.

- b) The proposed project, to allow residential second units in agricultural zoning districts is a text amendment that does not specifically propose any development. But these text amendment changes still require every second units to adhere to specific development guidelines and would also have to meet all building code requirements. The proposed ordinance changes to allow second units in agricultural zoning districts might cumulatively have incremental impacts to some environmental resources, but to a less than significant level.